

Authors: The similar sentences identified by crosscheck have been rewritten. The running title has been added.

Reviewer 1: Well written paper with comprehensive review regarding metal hypersensitivity of TKA. Great work.

Authors reply: we thank you for your appraisal

Reviewer 2: Manuscript titled “Allergy in total knee replacement surgery: is it a real problem?” deals an important issue of clinical orthopedics. The present review aimed to provide an overview on diagnosis and management of metal hypersensitivity in patients who undergo a TKA in order clarify its real importance. This is a well written interesting article; however, some minor revisions are needed before to accept for publication. First sentence, missing a reference, please quote the following appropriate citation: Clinical evidence of traditional vs fast track recovery methodologies after total arthroplasty for osteoarthritic knee treatment. A retrospective observational study. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J.* 2018 Jan 10;7(3):504-513. The introduction section is lack of important information. Please improve the state of the art discussing different aspect of osteoarthritis, the first cause for total knee replacement surgery. Please discuss and quote the following papers. Ameliorative effects of PACAP against cartilage degeneration. Morphological, immunohistochemical and biochemical evidence from in vivo and in vitro models of rat osteoarthritis. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2015 Mar 13;16(3):5922-44. Physical activity ameliorates cartilage degeneration in a rat model of aging: a study on lubricin expression. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2015 Apr;25(2):e222-30. To help better readers understanding, immediately, the aim of this review, I suggest to add some figures or a graphical abstract. In the conclusion please specify the clinical relevance of your work and some important suggestions for the scientific community.

Authors reply: Osteoarthritis has been discussed in lines 103-109, citing the suggested papers. In line 110 the suggested reference has been added (reference 5). The conclusion has been enriched as you can see in line 355-357.

Reviewer 3: poorly written-for it one considered entire manuscript needs to be re written

Authors reply: we modified the manuscript according to the indications of the other reviewers.

Reviewer 4: The title is referring directly to the problem at hand. The abstract is sufficient. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. Introduction is clear. Material and Methods are missing Authors describe their work as review but do not report what they asses or evaluate Results is missing Discussion also is missing, although part of it is included to the various subchapters, Limitations the non-reference to the work being evaluated deprives the reader of knowledge of these tasks, which are not replaced by reference to references The authors conclude “[...] in cases of positive history and positive tests a hypersensitivity-friendly implant should be considered. However, there is still a lack of evidence regarding correlation between metal hypersensitivity and implant related complications.” References are cited appropriately the latest references in the introduction and discussion sections, while the submitted manuscript is supported by 50 references. The submitted manuscript is dealing with the “Allergy in total knee replacement surgery: is it a real problem?” is describing clearly the signs and symptoms of the condition which is a rare phenomenon as well as the aetiology and therapy. Material and methods, Results and Discussion are missing thus weakens its value. The submitted manuscript needs revision in order to be accepted for publication in the WJO.

Authors reply: The manuscript is a minireview, so it does not require the presence of specific sections.